

REMARKS

Claim 5 has been cancelled. Claims 1-4 and 6-8 remain pending in the Application.

35 U.S.C. 102(b)

In the previous rejections, Claim 1 has been rejected under 32 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bostrom et al. (5,856,632). The rejection alleges that Bostrom discloses an assembly comprising: a filler panel body (40, card cage shielding contactor for example). However, Applicant respectfully disagrees that the card cage shielding contactor 40 is analogous to the filler panel body of the present claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that Independent Claim 1 includes the feature, a filler panel body. As described in the instant Application, the filler panel body is adapted for enclosing a slot of a chassis which does not have a printed circuit assembly (PCA) therein. Support for the description and use of the filler panel body of Claim 1 can be found throughout the Application including page 1 lines 19-25.

Applicant has reviewed the Bostrom reference and understands Bostrom to utilize a different name for the filler panel body. Bostrom describes a circuit card bracket 14 in the description of Figures 1 and 2. In addition at column 3 lines 4-15 Bostrom further describes that it is noted that where there are unused openings, the unused openings must be covered with a **blank circuit card bracket** in order to maintain the shielding integrity of the computer chassis and

avoid unwanted electromagnetic and radio frequency emissions...to this end Bostrom provides a card cage shielding contactor to be interposed between each bracket and the computer chassis.

Therefore, Applicant understands the bracket , specifically the blank circuit card bracket not the card cage shielding contactor of Bostrom, to be analogous to the filler panel body. Moreover, if the card cage shielding contactor is the same as the blank circuit card bracket, then the card cage shielding contactor cannot be interposed between each bracket and the computer chassis.

Furthermore, Bostrom does not teach anything regarding the blank circuit card bracket but instead teaches a card cage shielding contactor to be interposed between each bracket and the computer chassis.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that Independent Claim 1 is not anticipated in view of Bostrom. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 2-3 and 6-8 were also rejected under 35USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Bostrom. Claims 2-3 and 6-8 are dependent upon independent Claim 1 and incorporate all the limitations thereof. Thus, Claims 2-3 and 6-8 are allowable for the reasons advanced with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 4-5 were also rejected under 35USC 103(a) as being obvious in view of Bostrom. Claim 5 has been cancelled herein and therefore the rejection of Claim 5 is moot. Claim 4 is dependent upon independent Claim 1 and incorporates all the limitations thereof. Thus, Claim 4 is allowable for the reasons advanced with respect to Claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP

Date: 1/21/04



John P. Wagner Jr.
Reg. No. 35,398

Two North Market Street
Third Floor
San Jose, California 95113
(408) 938-9060